

Within Johnston County, employment in the agricultural sector declined by 47.1 percent. In 1960, agriculture was the major employer and manufacturing was second; by 1970 manufacturing was first, and those employed in the wholesale and retail trade were second--agriculture had slipped to third place.

While the percentage of those employed in manufacturing led all others in the county by 1970, this distinction was clearly in evidence in Selma in 1960 with 29.5 percent working in the manufacturing sector. The economy of Selma in 1960 was based on manufacturing, the retail and wholesale trade, and government and other professional services.

By 1970 the percentage of Selma residents employed in manufacturing had grown to 35.2 percent of those employed (a growth of 92.4 percent over the decade). One interesting contrast is the growth in employment in the wholesale and retail trade; while this sector grew at a rate of 24.6 percent within the county, it grew by 35.8 percent within the town but now only 17.7 percent of those employed work in this field.

In summation, a greater percentage of Selma residents are employed in manufacturing industries than those of the county and their movement into these jobs has been more pronounced than the other county residents.

C. Land Use Survey Analysis

Residential

There are 1,389 residential structures (1,475 units) in Selma in 1976 compared to 1,385 in 1970. While the residential growth has been particularly heavy in the northeastern quadrant, the impact of the Neighborhood Development Programs (NDPs), the code enforcement program, and the widening of U. S. 301 has almost offset the general increase in structures.

The 1,264 standard structures (1,349 units) amounted to 91.0 percent of the total; in 1970 the comparable figures were 436 and 32.7 percent. Deteriorating structures amounted to 99 (101 units) or 7.5 percent of the total; comparable figures for 1970 were 719 and 54.3 percent. The number of dilapidated structures (and units) had fallen to 24 (or 1.7 percent) from 175 (or 1.30 percent) for six years earlier.

On a percentage basis, these changes are impressive but also somewhat deceptive. Summarizing the preceding paragraph, the number of standard structures rose 190 percent (from 436 to 1,264), deteriorating structures declined 86.4 percent (from 719 to 99), and dilapidated structures decreased by 86.4 percent (from 175 to 24).

What are some of the possible explanations for such impressive statistical changes? One would appear to be the difficulty inherent